

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XI, Issue No. 9

March 2006

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

"I Trusted My Country"

By Garrett Reppenhagen

Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony to the [House Appropriations Subcommittee for] Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs.

I joined the Army in August of 2001 and became a Cavalry Scout at Ft. Knox, Kentucky. I was indoctrinated into a military that I was proud of and had the courage to serve because I trusted that the government of the United States would use me in a responsible and necessary manner.

I was on leave from a deployment in Kosovo when the ultimatum for Saddam and his sons to surrender ran out. Bradleys crossed the line into Iraq, and Baghdad was exploding on the televisions. Surrounding me at the Dallas/Ft. Worth airport were a crowd of people cheering like the Cowboys just won the Super Bowl. I started to feel like the reality of war and the policies of the administration were not as honest as they appeared.

In February of 2004, it was my turn to go to war. I was with 2d Bn 63d Armor 1st Infantry Division stationed in Baquba, Iraq, as a Sniper in a six-man team. During my year there, I saw a lack of effort by our government to provide the US Soldier with the ability to win the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. As events unfolded, like Abu Ghraib and the battles in Fallujah, a growing resentment of the Iraqi people swelled the support for the insurgency. Our mission there became impossible.

We turned all our missions into surviving Iraq for a year, missions like counter ambush, counter mortar, road clearing and house raids. No longer were we able to attempt reconstruction operations. The

alienation of the people we were supposed to be trying to hand democracy to increased and the Improvised Explosive Devices, Rocket Propelled Grenade ambushes and mortar attacks increased.

I left Iraq, eventually was honorably discharged after a ten month involuntary extension, and returned home to begin working for veteran advocacy. I frequently visit Walter Reed and speak to veterans struggling with Post Trauma Stress Disorder and other forms of mental illness. It is a constant frustration to see these men and women treated without proper care and respect. And the problem is only growing.

These soldiers are overcoming the most unimaginable physical and mental disabilities. But the question they all eventually begin to ask is "Why?" ***With the growing public opinion being that war was not only wrong, but also based on lies, the soldier who was sent to fight has a conflict with the fact that his sacrifice had no meaning. The lack of meaning ultimately creates a breakdown of character that is fundamental in a soldier's degradation of mental health. Because the war is so "wrong," it can create not just a guilt of the traumatic experience in Iraq, it also makes the soldiers shameful of the people they have become.***

These soldiers return home to ticker tape parades and "thank you's," when the soldier many times feels like a criminal. Most hold on to the ideal that it was a noble cause, to protect their character from the damaging truth. However eventually, over time, that protective bubble will pop. Whether conscious of it or not, because these soldiers are never punished by society

and their leaders are not being held accountable, the veteran takes on self-destructive habits and sometimes commits suicide. We hold ourselves accountable, and sometimes cannot live with the pain.

We need to remove our military from a war it should have never been involved in. Without the use of our military in honest operations, the psychological impact on our service members will be unavoidable. Trauma from war is another injury of combat and is a natural reaction to being in a violent environment. Added with the loss of meaning, it can be severe. The only way to put an end to it is to withdraw troops immediately from Iraq and bring them home now.

The following is a piece of the last letter SPC Douglas Barber, an Iraq War Veteran, wrote before taking his own life in January 2006:

All is not okay or right for those of us who return home alive and supposedly well. What looks like normalcy and readjustment is only an illusion to be revealed by time and torment. Some soldiers come home missing limbs and other parts of their bodies. Still others will live with permanent scars from horrific events that no one other than those who served will ever understand.

We come home from war trying to put our lives back together but some cannot stand the memories and decide that death is better. They kill themselves because they are so haunted by seeing children killed and whole families wiped out.

They ask themselves how you put a price tag on someone else's life. The question goes unanswered as they become another casualty of the war. Heroes become another statistic to America and they are another little

article relegated to the back of a newspaper.

Still others come home to nothing. Families have abandoned them: husbands and wives have left these soldiers, and so have parents as well. Post Traumatic Stress Disorder has become the norm amongst these soldiers because they don't know how to cope with returning to a society that will never understand what they have had to endure to liberate another country.

-- House testimony March 1, 2006

* * * *

Critics of pre-emptive war include President Abraham Lincoln. In an 1848 letter to his law partner, William Herndon, Lincoln criticized then President Polk's pre-emptive war against Mexico: *Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose, and you allow him to make war at pleasure.... If today he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, "I see no probability of the British invading us," but he will say to you, "Be silent; I see it, if you don't."* -- Abraham Lincoln

A Critical Guide to the Second Amendment -- Part I

By Glenn Harlan Reynolds

What distinguishes the Second Amendment scholarship from that relating to other constitutional rights, such as privacy or free speech, is that there appears to be far more agreement on the general outlines of Second Amendment theory than exists in those other areas. Indeed, there is sufficient consensus on many issues that one can properly speak of a "Standard Model" in Second Amendment theory. The agreement is not complete: within the Standard Models are parts that are subject to disagreement. But the overall framework for analysis, the questions regarded as being clearly resolved, and those regarded as still open, are all generally agreed upon.

The Standard Model is rooted in two main sources: the text of the Second Amendment [A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed] and its historical underpinnings. Both are interpreted to

support an individual right to keep and bear arms. The text's support is seen as straightforward: the language used, after all, is "right of the people," a term that appears in other parts of the Bill of Rights that are universally interpreted as protecting individual rights. Thus, any argument that the right protected is not one enforceable by individuals is undermined by the text.

Thus, say Standard Model writers, the Second Amendment protects the same sort of individual right that other parts of the Bill of Rights provide. To hold otherwise, these writers argue, is to do violence to the Bill of Rights since, if one "right of the people" could be held not to apply to individuals, then so could others. Furthermore, as William Van Alstyne notes, the "right" to which the Second Amendment refers is clearly the right "of the people, to keep and bear arms." Thus, whatever the meaning of the Amendment's reference to a "well-regulated militia," that reference does not modify the right recognized by the Amendment.

This textual argument is also supported by reference to history. Standard Model scholars muster substantial evidence that the Framers intended the Second Amendment to protect an individual right to arms. The first piece of evidence for this proposition is that such a right was protected by the English Bill of Rights of 1689. As such, it became one of the "Rights of Englishmen" around which the American Revolutionaries initially rallied. Standard Model scholars also stress that the right to keep and bear arms was seen as serving two purposes. First, it allowed individuals to defend themselves from outlaws of all kinds--not only ordinary criminals, but also soldiers and government officials who exceeded their authority, for in the legal and philosophical framework of the time no distinction was made between the two. Just as importantly, the presence of an armed populace was seen as a check on government tyranny and on the power of a standing army. With the citizenry armed, imposing tyranny would be far more difficult than it would be with the citizenry defenseless.

Tench Coxe (1755-1824) made this point in a commentary on the Second Amendment. Coxe explained the purpose of the Amendment this way:

"As civil rulers, not having their duty to the people duly before them, may attempt to tyrannize, and as the military forces which must be occasionally raised to defend our

country, might pervert their power to the injury of their fellow citizens, the people are confirmed by the next article in their right to keep and bear *their private arms*."

Similarly, James Madison himself wrote that a regular army that threatened liberty would find itself opposed by "a militia amounting to near a half a million citizens with arms in their hands." Madison contrasted the situation in America with that obtaining under the European governments, whom he described as "afraid to trust the people with arms," and argued that the new federal government need not be feared because Americans possessed "the advantage of being armed, which the Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation."

Standard Model scholars note that these statements were echoed by similar sentiments from other Framers, all of whom seem to have been proponents of the individual ownership of firearms. Thomas Jefferson was a vigorous advocate of gun ownership because he believed that it fostered both personal and societal virtue. a model constitution that he drafted for Virginia in 1776 included a provision guaranteeing that "[n]o Freeman shall be debarred the use of arms [within his own lands]." Similarly, Anti-Federalist Patrick Henry agreed, stating that "The great object is that every man be armed.... Every one who is able may have a gun."

Thus, the right to keep and bear arms was considered an essential form of protection not just for home and hearth, but also against government tyranny. It can be understood as yet another of the forms of division of power that the Framers created to protect citizens' liberties. It is commonplace to note that the Framers divided power within the federal government, by apportioning it among three branches, and that the Framers divided government power in general by splitting it between the federal government and the governments of the states. But under the Standard Model approach it is fair to say that the Framers divided power yet another way, by ensuring that the citizenry possessed sufficient military power to offset that of the Federal government. Such a division makes sense in light of such other Constitutional language as the Preamble's statement that the authority of the government comes from the people, and the similar statement in the

Tenth Amendment. If the federal and state governments are merely agents of the people, it is logical that the people would be reluctant to surrender a monopoly on military power to their servants, for fear that their servants might someday become their masters.

This was certainly the view of commentators throughout the nineteenth century. As Justice Joseph Story wrote in his *Commentaries on the Constitution*: "The right of the citizens to keep and bear arms has justly been considered as the palladium of the liberties of a republic, since it offers a strong moral check against the usurpation and arbitrary power of rulers, and will generally, even if these are successful in the first instance, enable the people to resist and triumph over them."

Influential nineteenth-century scholar Thomas Cooley made the same point: "The right of the people to bear arms in their own defence, and to form and drill military organizations in defence of the State, may not be very important in this country, but it is significant as having been reserved by the people as a possible and necessary resort for the protection of self-government against usurpation, and against any attempt on the part of those who may for the time be in possession of State authority or resources to set aside the constitution and substitute their own rule for that of the people. Should the contingency ever arise when it would be necessary for the people to make use of the arms in their hands for the protection of constitutional liberty, the proceeding, so far from being revolutionary, would be in strict accord with popular right and duty."

This point is the key underpinning of the standard model's approach. The right to keep and bear arms exists in the people because it is there for their own protection. Note Cooley's distinction between the people's "own defence" and the "defence of the state." This distinction carries with it the clear implication that "the people" and "the state" are not the same thing.

-- 62 Tenn. L. Rev. 461-511 (1995)

The Performance Evaluation

1. "Since my last report, this employee has reached rock-bottom and has started to dig."

2. "This employee is really not so much of a has-been, but more of a definite won't be."

3. "Works well when under constant supervision and cornered like a rat in a trap."

4. "When he opens his mouth, it seems that it is only to change feet."

5. "He sets low personal standards and then consistently fails to achieve them."

6. "This employee should go far, and the sooner he starts the better."

7. "Got a full 6-pack, but lacks the plastic thingy to hold it all together."

8. "A gross ignoramus - 144 times worse than an ordinary ignoramus."

9. "He brings a lot of joy whenever he leaves the room."

10. "When his IQ reaches 50, he should sell."

11. "Some drink from the fountain of knowledge; he only gargled."

Camden, NJ, Still the "Most Dangerous"

For the second consecutive year Camden, NJ, has been named the U.S.' "most dangerous city," based on its violent crime, burglary and motor vehicle theft rates, according to the Morgan Quitno organization's report released Nov. 21, 2005.

Clearly, with a murder rate 70% higher than Washington, D.C.'s, Camden has a problem.

Naturally the gun controllers have the wrong explanation. Bryan Miller, of Ceasefire, NJ, blames Camden's crime problem on Pennsylvania's less restrictive gun laws. However Camden's murder rate is 173% higher than Philadelphia's, which is just a stone's throw across the Delaware river from Camden.

Since 1991, when murder rates began decreasing nationally, New Jersey's rate dropped 14%, but Camden's rose 52%. During the period 1991-2004 the national murder rate declined 44% versus New Jersey's 14%, suggesting that NJ, especially Camden, might be better off with gun laws more like those in Pennsylvania and most other states.

-- *America's 1st Freedom*, Feb. 2006

Anti-gunner Alert

Some of you might have recently heard of a new organization claiming to represent hunters and gun owners. As is often the case this organization builds a nice website and claims to be a friend of hunters when the reality is they are nothing more than the enemy in camouflage.

The group calls itself the American Hunters and Shooters Association, a friendly sounding name designed to part unsuspecting hunters and shooters from their hard earned dollars. They claim to be a "rational" voice in the hunting and gun rights policy debate, implying that groups like the National Rifle Association are irrational.

Everything about AHSA sounds warm and fuzzy, that is unless you take the time to look deeper into their website. Quickly you realize that they want to regulate certain calibers of guns, allow the FBI to keep records on people who buy guns and put an end to gun shows as we know them.

The most telling thing about AHSA is its leadership. Bob Ricker is listed as AHSA Executive Director. Hunters will remember that Ricker is a former NRA employee who switched sides and has actively worked for gun control groups for many years now. Most recently Ricker was paid by a Virginia based anti-gun group, where he lobbied to shut down gun shows and put further restrictions on gun owners.

John Rosenthal is listed as President of the AHSA Foundation. Rosenthal is one of the founders of the Massachusetts based group Stop Handgun Violence, a group that has been a major force in passing some of the most draconian state gun laws in the nation

With leadership like that, there is no doubt about the true goals of AHSA. They are trying to fool hunters and gun owners with a soft sell, while working behind the scenes to end the sport that we all love. I fully expect that we will see anti-gun Congressional candidates boasting their AHSA endorsements. Unfortunately, some gun owners will be fooled by this rhetoric, so help us spread the word that AHSA isn't what they claim to be.

-- www.nraila.org

A Muslim Speaks Out

Ever since Dr Wafa Sultan, a physician in Los Angeles, appeared on Al-Jazeera, the Arabic TV network, last summer she has been receiving death threats. During that and a second broadcast in February Dr Sultan, who was brought up as a Muslim in Syria, denounced the teachings and practice of Islam as "barbaric" and "medieval."

"The clash we are witnessing around the world is not a clash of religions, or a clash of civilisations," the impassioned 47-year-old told Al-Jazeera's stunned audience across the Arab world. "It is a clash between

civilisation and backwardness, between the civilised and the primitive, between barbarity and rationality. It is a clash between human rights on the one hand and the violation of these rights on the other, between those who treat women like beasts and those who treat them like human beings."

The broadcasts have caused an unholy stir in the Muslim world and virtually overnight have turned Sultan, previously known only to a few for her writings on www.annaged.com, a small Arab-American website, into one of the most controversial figures in the international debate about Islam. The broadcasts have been downloaded more than 1m times from the internet and she has been interviewed on CNN and profiled by *The New York Times* and *Le Monde*.

While some acclaim her as "a voice of reason" others have denounced her as a "heretic" and insist that she deserves to die. What seems to have most infuriated many Muslims were Sultan's comparisons between how Jews and Muslims have coped with the tragedies that have befallen them.

"The Jews have come from tragedy and forced the world to respect them," she said, "with their knowledge, not with their terror; with their work, not with their crying and yelling.

"We have not seen a single Jew blow himself up in a German restaurant. We have not seen a single Jew destroy a church. We have not seen a single Jew protest by killing people. Only the Muslims defend their beliefs by burning down churches, killing people and destroying embassies. The Muslims must ask themselves what they can do for humankind, before they demand that humankind respect them."

As a medical student in Damascus, Sultan says she never had any reason to doubt her faith. But in 1979 she witnessed a horrifying crime. As she stood chatting with some other students on the university courtyard, members of the Muslim Brotherhood began shooting at one of her teachers, killing him on the spot.

"They filled his body with bullets as they shouted 'Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! (God is greatest!),' she recalls. She says they killed him because he was an Alawite, a member of the same Muslim sect as the Syrian president Hafez al-Assad, whom they wanted to overthrow, even though he had nothing to do with politics.

"This was the turning point of my life," says Sultan. She began to reread the Koran closely, gradually

coming to the conclusion that the violence and oppression of most Muslim governments and some of those fighting against them stemmed directly from the teachings of Islam.

"I began to question every single teaching," she says. ***She noticed that "there are too many verses in the Koran which say you must kill those who are non-Muslim; you must kill those who don't believe in Allah and his messenger. I started to ask: is this right? Is this human? All our problems in the Islamic world, I strongly believe, are the natural outcome of these teachings. Go open any book in any class in any school in any Islamic country and read it. You will see what kind of teachings we have: Islam tells its followers that every non-Muslim is your enemy."***

-- Sunday Times, March 21, 2006

N.H. House Says No to National ID

Patrick Henry said "Give me liberty or give me death." New Hampshire's motto is just as direct: "Live free or die."

With such defiance in the face of tyranny, it was no surprise when the state's House of Representatives took a stand to defend the civil liberties of their fellow citizens.

Rep. Neal Kurk co-sponsored a bill (HB 1582) that prohibits New Hampshire from participating in the federal government's national ID card program: "The general court finds that the public policy established by Congress in the Real ID Act of 2005, Public Law 109-13, is contrary and repugnant to Articles 1 through 10 of the New Hampshire constitution as well as Amendments 4 through 10 of the Constitution for the United States of America. Therefore, the state of New Hampshire shall not participate in a national identification card system; nor shall the department of safety amend the procedures for applying for a driver's license under RSA 263 or an identification card under RSA 260:21."

Rep. Kurk stated the reason for his position in a speech on the House floor. "I don't believe that the people of New Hampshire elected us to help the federal government create a national identification card," he said. "We care more for our liberties than to meekly hand over to the federal government the potential to enumerate, track, identify and eventually control."

Ed.: Let's see, New Jersey's state motto is "Liberty and Prosperity".

Therefore, the N. J. legislature will ...aw forget it, no way!

People Most Generous in States with Fewer Guns Laws?

According to the *Christian Science Monitor* (Nov. 29, 2005) the Catalogue of Philanthropy, a Boston-based nonprofit, ranks Mississippi No. 1 in its annual Generosity Index, which is based on average adjusted gross incomes and the value of itemized deductions declared on 2003 federal tax returns.

The 10 most generous states, from the latest index:

1. Mississippi	F
2. Arkansas	D
3. South Dakota	D
4. Oklahoma	D-
5. Tennessee	D+
6. Alabama	F
7. Louisiana	F
8. Utah	D-
9. South Carolina	C-
10. West Virginia	D

We took the letter ratings, as of 2003, from the gun control group, the Brady Campaign. Except for South Carolina, it appears that states whose governments most treat their citizens like free adults are populated by people who dig the deepest into their own pockets for charity.

PATRIOT Act Update

The PATRIOT Act has been renewed with only two curbs on government power: (1) recipients of court-approved subpoenas for information in terrorist investigations will have the right to challenge a requirement that they refrain from telling anyone. (2) the new act clarifies that most libraries are not subject to demands in "national security letters" for information about suspected terrorists.

Constitutional Chaos

By Andrew P. Napolitano

The recently renewed Patriot Act is an unforgivable assault on basic American values and core constitutional liberties. The new Patriot Act continues to give federal agents the power to write their own search warrants – the statute's newspeak terminology calls them "national security letters" – and serve them on a host of persons and entities that regularly gather and store sensitive, private information on virtually every American.

Congress respected the Fourth Amendment until it enacted the

Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) in 1977, prior to which Americans and even non-citizens physically present here enjoyed the right to privacy guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment. That Amendment - written out of a revulsion to warrants that let British soldiers look for any tangible thing anywhere they chose -- specifically requires that the government demonstrate to a judge and the judge specifically find the existence of probable cause of criminal activity on the part of the person whose property the government wishes to search. The Fourth Amendment commands that only a judge can authorize a search warrant.

In 1978, cutting yet another hole in the Fourth Amendment, Congress revealed its distaste for the Constitution and its ignorance of the British government's abuse of the colonists by enacting the Orwellian-named, Right to Financial Privacy Act. This statute let federal agents write their own search warrants, but limited the subjects of those warrants to financial institutions. Just like FISA, it recognized the unconstitutional nature of evidence obtained by a self-written search warrant, and banned the use of such evidence in criminal prosecutions.

In 1986, Congress enacted the Electronic Communications Privacy Act which allowed federal agents to serve self-written search warrants on collectors of digital financial data, but continued to recognize that evidence thus obtained was constitutionally incompetent for criminal prosecution purposes.

The deepest cut came on October 15, 2001 when Congress enacted the Patriot Act. With minimal floor debate in the Senate and no floor debate in the House (House members were given only 30 minutes to read the 315 page bill), Congress enacted this most unpatriotic rejection of privacy and constitutional guarantees. Together with its offspring the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal 2004 and the Intelligence Reform Act of 2004, the Patriot Act not only permits the execution of self-written search warrants on a host of new subjects, it rejects the no-criminal-prosecution protections of its predecessors by requiring evidence obtained contrary to the Fourth Amendment to be turned over to prosecutors and mandating that such evidence is constitutionally competent in criminal prosecutions.

So Congress has authorized federal agents on their own, in violation of the Constitution, and without you knowing it, to obtain records about you

from your accountant, bank, boat dealer, bodega, book store, car dealer, casino, computer server, credit union, dentist, HMO, hospital, hotel manager, insurance company, jewelry store, lawyer, library, pawn broker, pharmacist, physician, postman, real estate agent, supermarket, tax collectors, telephone company, travel agency, and trust company, and use the evidence thus obtained in any criminal prosecution against you.

A self-written search warrant, even one called a national security letter, is the ultimate constitutional farce. What federal agents would not authorize themselves to seize whatever they wished? Who would trust government agents with this unfettered unreviewable power? The Framers did not. Why would government agents bother going to a judge with probable cause seeking a search warrant if they can simply write their own? Big Brother must have caught on because federal agents have written and executed self-written search warrants on over 120,000 unsuspecting Americans since October 2001.

Why have we fought for 230 years to keep foreign governments from eviscerating our freedoms if we will voluntarily let our own government do so?

-- Andrew P. Napolitano, a former judge of the Superior Court of New Jersey, is the senior judicial analyst at Fox News Channel, and the author of [Constitutional Chaos: What Happens When the Government Breaks Its Own Law](#)

America's Anti-Torture Tradition

By Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.

It is nice that the Bush administration has finally been pressured into backing a ban on cruel and inhumane treatment of prisoners. But what remains shocking about this embarrassing and distasteful national debate is that we had to have it at all. This administration's newfound enthusiasm for torture has not only damaged our international reputation, it has shattered one of our proudest American traditions.

Every schoolchild knows that Gen. George Washington made extraordinary efforts to protect America's civilian population from the ravages of war. Fewer Americans know that Revolutionary War leaders considered the decent treatment of enemy combatants to be one of the principal strategic preoccupations of the American Revolution.

"In 1776," wrote historian David Hackett Fischer in *Washington's Crossing*, "American leaders believed it was not enough to win the war. They also had to win in a way that was consistent with the values of their society and the principles of their cause. One of their greatest achievements was to manage the war in a manner that was true to the expanding humanitarian ideals of the American Revolution."

The fact that the patriots refused to abandon these principles, even when the enemy controlled our cities and our ragged army was barefoot and starving, credits the character of Washington and the founding fathers and puts to shame the conduct of America's present leadership.

Fischer writes that leaders in both the Continental Congress and the Continental Army resolved that the War of Independence would be conducted with a respect for human rights. This was all the more extraordinary because these courtesies were not reciprocated by King George's armies. Indeed, the British conducted a deliberate campaign of atrocities against American soldiers and civilians. While Americans extended quarter to combatants as a matter of right and treated their prisoners with humanity, British regulars and German mercenaries were threatened by their officers with severe punishment if they showed mercy to a surrendering American soldier. Captured Americans were tortured, starved and cruelly maltreated aboard prison ships.

Washington behaved differently. After capturing 1,000 Hessians in the Battle of Trenton, he ordered the prisoners be treated with the same rights for which our young nation was fighting. In an order covering prisoners taken in the Battle of Princeton, Washington wrote: "Treat them with humanity, and let them have no reason to Complain of our Copying the brutal example of the British Army in their treatment of our unfortunate brethren. Provide everything necessary for them on the road."

John Adams argued that humane treatment of prisoners and deep concern for civilian populations not only reflected the American Revolution's highest ideals, they were a moral and strategic requirement. In a 1777 letter to his wife, Adams wrote: "I know of no policy, God is my witness, but this: Piety, Humanity and Honesty are the best Policy. Blasphemy, Cruelty and Villainy have prevailed and may again. But they won't prevail against

America, in this Contest, because I find the more of them are employed, the less they succeed."

Even the British involved in the atrocities recognized their negative effects on the overall war effort. In 1778, Col. Charles Stuart wrote to his father, the Earl of Bute: "Wherever our armies have marched, wherever they have encamped, every species of barbarity has been executed. We planted an irrevocable hatred wherever we went, which neither time nor measure will be able to eradicate."

In the end, our founding fathers not only protected our national values, they defeated a militarily superior enemy. Indeed, it was their disciplined adherence to those values that helped them win a hopeless struggle against the best soldiers in Europe.

In accordance with this proud American tradition, President Lincoln instituted the first formal code of conduct for the humane treatment of prisoners of war in 1863. Lincoln's order forbade any form of torture or cruelty, and it became the model for the 1929 Geneva Convention. Dwight Eisenhower made a point to guarantee exemplary treatment to German POWs in World War II, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur ordered application of the Geneva Convention during the Korean War, even though the U.S. was not yet a signatory. In the Vietnam War, the United States extended the convention's protection to Viet Cong prisoners even though the law did not technically require it.

Today, our president is again challenged to align the conduct of a war with the values of our nation. America's treatment of its prisoners is a test of our faith in our country and the character of our leaders.

-- Los Angeles Times, Dec. 17, 2005

Robert F. Kennedy Jr. is an environmental lawyer and a professor at Pace University Law School.

Complaint Filed against State Troopers

New Orleans attorney Ashton O'Dwyer has filed a federal case against the Louisiana State Police and California State Police for the injuries Patricia Konie sustained when she was

body-slammed and dragged from her home in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina. The complaint alleges the violation of Konie's Second, Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment guarantees.

Konie, whose home was well stocked with food and water, was being interviewed by the media and was showing them her unloaded .32 caliber Colt revolver when the troopers burst in demanding that she evacuate the area. When they saw the gun they body slammed her.

O'Dwyer told CNN during the height of the gun confiscation and forced evacuation, "Has your neighborhood ever been invaded by state troopers from another state? Sent there by God knows whom? ...Treat me with benign neglect, get out of my life, get out of my XXX city."

-- *America's 1st Freedom*, March 2006

Petition for the Redress of Grievances

To the United States Congress:

We the People of the United States, do hereby demand that our duly elected representatives in both houses of Congress, initiate impeachment proceedings against the following Supreme Court Justices:

John Paul Stevens
Anthony Kennedy
David H. Souter
Ruth Bader Ginsburg
Stephen G. Breyer.

We, the undersigned, consider the Supreme Court ruling in *Kelo v. New London*, rendered June 23, 2005, not only unacceptable, but to be in criminal violation of the Justice's oaths to uphold, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. Despite what these five Justices have ruled, it is unlawful and immoral to allow municipalities to seize homes and other private property for commercial development.

Be advised that We the People regard elected officials to be our public servants. Failure to take action against the Justices specified shall be considered support for the decision rendered in the aforementioned case, and will result in our resolve to ensure your defeat in the next election. Being from myriad political and ideological spectra, we are

united in our belief that our right to own property is inalienable.

"The Bias Against Guns"

The Bias Against Guns by John R. Lott, Jr. is now being offered at a reduced price on the Gun Owners Foundation website.

Subtitled "Why Almost Everything You've Heard about Gun Control Is Wrong," Lott's work is an eye-opener. Want to know exactly how pollsters and government statisticians "cook" data to benefit the anti-gun lobby? How gun control is promoted in the national media in the guise of "news"? How gun grabbers actually get their hands on your tax dollars to further their agenda? This is the book for you.

Part II of the book goes beyond the pervasive bias and actually examines the cold, hard evidence regarding the benefits of gun ownership -- and the dangers of gun control.

This 349-page hardback lists for \$27.95, but is on sale to GOA supporters for only \$5.50 plus shipping.

Please see <http://www.gunowners.com/bookst.htm> for more details and to order your copy today.

From the Mail Bag

Thank you for the newsletter. I appreciate the choice items compacted together. May God bless you and save our country from tyranny and debauchery.

WW, Pennsylvania

* * *

Hello,

Looks like most recent issue I have is April '04 (my letter's in it). \$20 MO enclosed. Please send whatever you have since then. Hope you're still publishing. If not, I understand burnout. Keep the \$.

P.S. I appreciated learning about Art. 1, Sec. 1 of the NJ Constitution from you. They didn't teach us that in school.

YY, Bergen County

Ed.: The fire's smoking pretty bad, but it ain't burned out yet.

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 866-3288

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State ____ Zip _____